

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/000,039	Applicant(s) LANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Maryam Monshipouri	Art Unit 1652	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Maryam Monshipouri. (3)_____.

(2) Ms. Michele M. Simkin. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 23 September 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 41,43 and 53.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The new matter issue directed to claim 41 was brought up to the attention of Ms. Simkin. It was mutually agreed to change the language of the claim to overcome said rejection. The broadness of claim 43 rendered claim 43 subject to 112 first rejection. It was mutually agreed to recite the hybridization temperature to overcome said rejection. Finally Ms. simkin gave authority to the examiner to introduce claim 53, which had support in the disclosure and amend claims 41 and 43 in an examiner's amendment.